

- 2 -

Serial No. 09/531,818

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13576

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sebastian and claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian. These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Both independent claims 1 and 10 recite a method for distributing information concerning recommended steps for performing a process including the steps of: 1) providing a computer network for communicating digital data between at least two locations; 2) using the computer network to convey a request for a recommended process sequence of steps for performing a process from a first location to a second location; and 3) using the computer network to convey, from the second location to the first location, a response to the request that includes the recommended process sequence of steps.

Sebastian discloses a computer-based system and method for the concurrent design of a part, the tool to make the part, and the processes used in making the part. Sebastian utilizes a system having a central processing unit 32, a memory 34, an input device 35 and an output device 36. The input device 35 may be a link to another computer system for receiving instructions over a network (see column 11, lines 3-5). The output device 36 can be any device such as a computer monitor capable of displaying data and/or diagrams (see column 11, lines 5-8). The system contains a number of modules stored in the memory 34 and executed by the CPU 32. The CPU 32 executes the modules, particularly the core design module, to design the part, the tool to make the part, and the process to make the part.

The Examiner contends that Sebastian teaches the claimed step of conveying a request for a recommended process sequence of steps from a first location to a second location via a computer network. As discussed above, Sebastian does briefly discuss the use of a computer network, although the

- 3 -

Serial No. 09/531,818

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13576

reference does not specifically state that a request is sent from one location to another via a computer network. Nevertheless, even assuming for the sake of argument that Sebastian does disclose the first conveying step, the reference still fails to disclose the claimed step of using the computer network to convey, from the second location to the first location, a response to the request that includes a recommended process sequence of steps. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Sebastian that the design generated by the CPU 32 is conveyed over a computer network from the CPU 32 (the second location) back to a first location where the request originated. The Examiner asserts that this step is taught by lines 5-14 in column 11 of Sebastian. This passage indicates that the output device 36 can output information and diagrams concerning part geometry, draw direction, material specification and machine specification. However, there is no indication that the output device 36 is connected to the CPU 32 via a computer network. Therefore, there is no suggestion that the information displayed by the output device 36 is conveyed over a computer network. Sebastian fails to disclose conveying a recommended process sequence of steps over a computer network.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Sebastian. Claims 2-9 and claims 11-15 depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Furthermore, at least some of these dependent claims set forth limitations not met by the prior art. For instance, there does not appear to be any suggestion of using a decision tree or a notes tree in processing the recommended process, as set forth in claims 2-5. The passages cited by the Examiner do not disclose either decision trees or notes trees.

Independent claim 16 recites a method for providing information concerning recommended steps for performing a process. This method includes using a decision tree having at least two possible sequences of steps for

- 4 -

Serial No. 09/531,818

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13576

performing a process. Sebastian does not disclose providing a decision tree having at least two possible sequences of steps for performing a process or using, in a digital computer, a request and a decision tree to determine a recommended process sequence of steps for performing the process of a product.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 16 is allowable over Sebastian. Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-20 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

8/1/03

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon  
Reg. No. 34,500  
207-791-1276